

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

ANTHONY RICHARDS, SR.

*

Plaintiff,

*

v.

*

2:06-CV-239-MEF
(WO)

PIKE COUNTY JAIL ADMINISTRATION,
et al.,

*

*

Defendants.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff is an inmate incarcerated at the Pike County Jail. He brings this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that the conditions of confinement at the jail are unconstitutional. Plaintiff names as Defendants the Pike County Jail Administration, the Pike County Sheriff's Department, Mrs. Olivia, Captain Doug Wheeler, and Sheriff Russell Thomas. Upon review of the complaint, the court concludes that dismissal of Plaintiff's claims against the Pike County Jail Administration and the Pike County Sheriff's Department prior to service of process is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

DISCUSSION

Neither the Pike County Jail Administration nor the Pike County Sheriff's Department are legal entities and, therefore, they are not subject to suit or liability under § 1983. *See Dean v. Barber*, 951 F.2d 1210, 1214 (11th Cir. 1992). In light of the foregoing, the court

concludes that Plaintiff's claims against these defendants are due to be dismissed. *Id.*

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff's claims against the Pike County Jail Administration and the Pike County Sheriff's Department be DISMISSED with prejudice prior to service of process pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), and that these parties be DISMISSED as defendants to this complaint. It is further the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge that this case with respect to the remaining defendants be referred back to the undersigned for additional proceedings.

It is further

ORDERED that the parties are DIRECTED to file any objections to the said Recommendation **on or before April 3, 2006**. Any objections filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation objected to. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. The parties are advised that this Recommendation is not a final order of the court and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations in the Magistrate Judge's report shall bar the party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of issues covered in the report and shall bar the party from attacking on appeal factual findings in the report accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain

error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982). *See Stein v. Reynolds Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981, *en banc*), adopting as binding precedent all of the decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to the close of business on September 30, 1981.

Done this 20th day of March, 2006.

/s/Charles S. Coody
CHARLES S. COODY
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE